

shown on said transparent window.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that Covington discloses a transparent window because in Figs. 1 and 2 of this reference, the content of main window 105 can be seen. However, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner because the main window 105 cannot be seen through the video event window 150. Instead, video event window 150 covers main window 105, and the contents of main window 105 cannot be seen beneath video event window 150. Thus, video event window 150 is not transparent.

Accordingly, independent claim 1, and claims 2-3 depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited references.

Independent claim 17 recites "displaying, on a window displaying information controlled by an external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen"

Independent claim 21 recites "program code means for causing the computer to display, on a window displaying information controlled by an external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen"

Independent claim 25 recites "displaying, on a window displaying information controlled by an external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen"

Independent claim 26 recites "code causing the computer to display, on a window displaying information controlled by an external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen"

Independent claim 27 recites "a unit for displaying, on a window displaying information controlled by an external application program, a transparent window through which contents of the information controlled by the external application program is seen . . . the selected information is created as an information object so as to be shown on said transparent window."

Accordingly, claims 17, 21, 25 and 26-27 and claims 18 and 22 depending therefrom are patentable over the Examiner's cited references.

Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20, 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima, Khoyi, and Covington et al. and further in view of Person. Claims

13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima, Khoyi, Covington and Person and further in view of Microsoft.

Claims 4-16, 19-20 and 23-24 depend from independent claims 1, 17 and 21, and therefore are patentable over Nakajima, Khoyi and Covington et al. Neither Person nor Microsoft overcome the above deficiencies in Nakajima, Khoyi and Covington et al. and these references are not relied upon for this purpose. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4-5-02

By: 
Michael J. Badagliacca
Registration No. 39,099

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500